UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,986	06/22/2006	Philip Barrowclough	059864.01884	8417
	7590 05/26/201 DERS & DEMPSEY L	EXAMINER		
-	CRESCENT DRIVE	SIM, YONG H		
VIENNA, VA 2	22182-6212	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2629	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/26/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

IPGENERALTYC@SSD.COM SWHITNEY@SSD.COM

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/583,986	BARROWCLOUGH, PHILIP		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	YONG SIM	2629	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>03 May 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) $\boxtimes$ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	date of the final rejectio FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENIAN.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inplication and incline (i	102 02 1).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmen	t canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>37-50,52-60,63-65 and 68-75</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	. h . f		le e le entene d
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Amr Awad/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629			
oupervisory i atent Examiner, Art Offit 2023			

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejections of claim 37, 48 - 49, 55, 65, 71, 73 and 76.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicants mainly argue that Nading a Ely fail to disclose or suggest "wherein the portion of the light guide surface has a higher refractive index than the portion of the non-reflective actuator surface."

However, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner respectfully asserts that a design choice rejection was made in the previous Office Action regarding the above limitation. Examiner respectfully further asserts that there is a finite number of solutions to yield the same predictable result of detecting a change of the relative refractive index at a contacted portion of the light guide surface. The change of the relative refractive index can be detected by having the actuator that has a higher, lower or equal refractive index than the portion of the light guide surface. As indicated in the previous Office Action, Ely teaches detecting a relative change of light in the light guide by having an each intersection that has a refractive index that is equal or higher than the light substance. It would have been obvious to try to utilize the lower refractive of index into the teachings of Ely to yield the same predictable result of detecting a relative change of light in the light guide.